DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 651 UD 021 014

TITLE	A Study of Supplementary Training Available to Follow Through Parents and Aides. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Rehab Group, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Evaluation and Dissemination.
PUB DATE	18 Jun 80
CONTRACT	300-78-0521
NOTE	117p.; Some tables and appendices may be marginally legible due to reproduction quality of original document. Appendix F, "Computer Print-out Statistical Data," is not available.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education; *Adult Programs; Career Counseling; *Career Development; Career Education; Economic Opportunities; Educational Attainment; High School Equivalency Programs; Inservice Education; *Low Income Groups; *Parent Education; Parent Participation; Post Secondary Education; *School Aides; Secondary Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This report documents the planning, implementation, and outcomes of a study of the supplementary training available to Follow Through parents and aides. The first chapters outline the history and rationale of Follow Through Supplementary Training Programs and discuss the purpose, limitations, and methodology of the study. Detailed information is provided on: (1) the characteristics of the Supplementary Training Program; (2) demographic characteristics of program participants, including sex, age, race, and socio-economic, marital, educational, and employment status; and (3) attitudes of participants and project directors toward the program. Results indicate that subsequent to Supplementary Training, participants: (1) increased their level of education; (2) experienced a higher rate of employment; (3) improved their economic status through upward job mobility; and (4) increased their personal income. Results also disclose that participant terminations from the program were not associated with participants' perceptions of the program and its effectiveness, and that both participants and project directors displayed positive attitudes about the program. Sample questionnaires are included in the appendix, and college/university affiliations of the program are listed. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200651

OFFICE OF EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION
CONTRACT NO. 300-78-0521

FINAL REPORT

A STUDY OF SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING AVAILABLE TO FOLLOW THROUGH PARENTS AND AIDES

THIS REPORT IS MADE PURSUANT TO CONTRACT NO. 300-78-0521. THE AMOUNT CHARGED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE FOR THE WORK RESULTING IN THIS REPORT (INCLUSIVE OF THE AMOUNT SO CHARGED FOR ANY PRIOR REPORTS SUBMITTED UNDER THIS CONTRACT) IS $63,499. THE NAMES OF THE PERSONS, EMPLOYED OR RETAINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, WITH MANAGERIAL OR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SUCH WORK, OR FOR THE CONTENT OF THE REPORT, ARE AS FOLLOWS:

LORENZO E. REID
PATRICIA ARMIJO
L. EDWARD COVINGTON, JR.
ERNESTO A. GUERRA
GUY McCOMBS III
JEFFERY D. PETERSOHN
ROBERT M. POLITZER

PREPARED BY:
REHAB GROUP, INCORPORATED
5827 COLUMBIA PIKE
FALLS CHURCH, VIRGINIA 22041
JUNE 18, 1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD021014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
1.0	FOREWORD	1-1
1.1	ENABLING LEGISLATION AND FUNDING	1-1
1.2	OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	1-3
2.0	INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.1	HISTORY/RATIONALE OF FT/ST PROGRAMS	2-1
3.0	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	3-1
3.1	QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FT/ST PROGRAMS	3-1
4.0	METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	4-1
4.1	QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN	4-1
4.1.1	Project Director Questionnaire	4-1
4.1.2	Participant Questionnaire	4-2
4.1.3	In-depth Interview Questionnaire	4-3
4.2	SELECTION OF SAMPLING FRAME	4-4
4.2.1	Distribution and Sizes of ST Projects	4-4
4.2.2	Participant Sample	4-5
4.2.3	In-depth Sampling Plan	4-7
4.2.4	Pre-Test	4-9
4.3	PROCESSING OF THE DATA	4-9
5.0	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	5-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONT'D

SECTION	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
6.0	FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	6-1
6.1	PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS	6-1
6.1.1	Comments on Program Characteristics	6-4
6.2	SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS .	6-6
6.2.1	Racial Makeup of Respondents	6-6
6.2.2	Sex of Respondents	6-6
6.2.3	Present Age of Respondents	6-7
6.2.4	Present Marital Status	6-7
6.2.5	Current Household Membership	6-8
6.2.6	Entry into ST Program	6-9
6.2.7	Changes in Education	6-11
6.2.8	Current Standing in ST Program	6-15
6.2.9	Fields of Study	6-18
6.2.10	Changes in Employment Status	6-19
6.2.11	Changes in Type of Employment	6-21
6.2.12	Changes in Type of Housing	6-29
6.2.13	Changes in Own/Rent	6-29
6.2.14	Changes in Personal Income	6-30
6.2.15	Academic Success (G.P.A.)	6-31
6.3	ATTITUDES	6-32
6.3.1	Attitudes of Participants and Project Directors . . .	6-32
6.3.2	Attitudes from the In-Depth Study	6-37
7.0	DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	7-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONT'D

APPENDICES	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
A	PROJECT DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE	A-1
B	PARTICIPANT TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE	B-1
C	IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE	C-1
D	AFFILIATED COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES	D-1
E	REFERENCES	E-1
F	COMPUTER PRINT-OUT STATISTICAL DATA (DELIVERED UNDER SEPARATE COVER)	F-1

1.6 FOREWORD

1.0 FOREWORD

The following is an account of the planning, implementation, and outcomes of "A Study of Supplementary Training Available to Follow Through Parents and Aides." The study was conducted by Rehab Group, Inc. for the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, United States Office of Education, during the period October 1, 1978 through November 16, 1979.

1.1 ENABLING LEGISLATION AND FUNDING

At the urging of the President, the Follow Through (FT) program was authorized by Congress over twelve years ago.[1] At that time it represented a new program entry in the Great Society. It was to provide eligible low-income children with a variety of educational, health, and social services.

The program was re-authorized by Congress in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972. Two years later, the Community Services Act of 1974 further extended authorization of the program.[2]

Currently, the Follow Through program is administered by the Office of Education. Its offerings include instructional, nutritional, medical, dental, and comprehensive social services to children in grades one through three who are from economically disadvantaged families. Such services, presumably, are intended to compensate for the kinds of supports which, due to the low-income status of their families, have been denied to this population of children.

[1]Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, P.L. 88-452 (78 Stat. 508), as amended in P.L. 90-222, TOT. 1, SEC. 104 (81 Stat. 698, 42 U.S.C. 2809 (a) (2) 1967).

[2]Community Services Act of 1974, P.L. 93-644, Title V, Part B (USC 2929) known as "The Headstart-Follow Through Act."

Even at the time of its inception via Follow Through, compensatory education in the public schools, for children from low-income families, was certainly not a new concept. As implied by the name "Follow Through," the antecedents for this program lay elsewhere in time. The Headstart (HS) program, which provided services similar to those of Follow Through for disadvantaged pre-school children, had been initiated four years earlier.[1]

"Follow Through" was intended to sustain, or perhaps improve upon, gains previously made with this population of children in Headstart, or similar pre-school programs.

There is yet another application of compensatory education in the HS and FT programs. Designers of these programs were cognizant that the criteria set for children's eligibility highlighted an even more pervasive problem. The need for instruction, health, and other supplements being provided to children through these programs, developed, in large measure, because their parents were economically disadvantaged. As an outgrowth of this perception of the problem, job and training opportunities in these programs were made available to low-income parents and school aides. The component of the HS and FT programs which offered these opportunities fell under the general title of "Supplementary Training (ST)."

The following study deals exclusively with the ST component of Follow Through programs during the years 1974 through 1978. The rationale upon which the study is based " ... developed from the need to provide a description of the program and progress of students in Supplementary Training."[2] The specific thrust of the study is "... to present a historical account of the Supplementary Training component of Follow Through as specified ..."[3] by certain descriptive information.

[1]Although launched by the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1965, Headstart is now administered by the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

[2]Statement appearing in the Request For Proposals, "Study of Supplementary Training Available to Follow Through Parents and Aides," issued by the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[3]Ibid.

1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Over the past decade, researchers of student achievement have increasingly come to conclude that a significant factor in student achievement is the degree to which parents are aware of the kinds of activity and behavior that are likely to heighten children's school performance. Moreover, parents must trust the notion that their children's life circumstances can be enhanced through education. While not a measured objective of this study, this concept may well have, in part, provided the motivation for assessing parental attitudes about education. This study makes no attempt to confirm or deny the aforementioned conclusions.

In their participation in higher education, FT parents (who make up the large majority of Supplementary Training participants) constitute a population quite distinct from that made up of recent high school graduates who are college bound. In contrast, this population is older, has children, is likely to have been unemployed, on welfare roles, or on other forms of marginal subsistence.

As the study was undertaken, these factors were thought to possibly be the generators of unique needs, unrecognized abilities, special problems, uncommon learning styles, etc., which these participants brought to higher education. It was assumed that these potentials would be affected by, and have impact upon, (1) the FT projects, and (2) the Supplementary Training programs themselves.

The study was to be retrospective in order to examine and document such factors as changes in life circumstances and attitudes of trainees, differences in training offerings provided to trainees, cost factors in providing training, and employment profiles.

Taking all of the factors to be documented into account, the study was designed to provide insight into the:

- Characteristics of participants in ST;
- Characteristics of the ST projects (i.e., administration);
- Characteristics of the training received.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 INTRODUCTION

There have been a great number of studies devoted to describing the characteristics and impact of educational programs designed to enhance the upward mobility of the disadvantaged. These programs have been generally referred to as compensatory education programs. The disadvantaged are exemplified as those persons ... "who have been socialized into a set of attitudes, values, and norms which inhibit their educational achievement and impede subsequent occupational mobility."[1]

2.1 HISTORY/RATIONALE OF FT/ST PROGRAMS

The Follow Through programs were authorized by Congress to provide eligible low-income children with a variety of educational, health, and social services. Subsequent amendments to the legislation made provisions for financial assistance, employment, and career development for parents of Follow Through children.

This study is principally concerned with the career development component of the Follow Through program. Historically, the purpose of Supplementary Training has been to provide non-professionals and sub-professionals the opportunity for post-secondary education course work. Compensatory services are a vital part of the program.

The programs are generally funded to and carried out by local education agencies (LEAs) working in conjunction with local schools and institutions of higher education (IHE) for the purposes of:

- Providing career development opportunities for Follow Through personnel by establishing academic programs leading toward a college degree;

[1] James Morrison, Eugene Watson, Jerry Goldsteen, Compensatory Education in the Community College: An Interactivist Approach, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, California, 1975, p. 3.

- Providing Follow Through programs with increasingly skilled staff members; and,
- Providing an opportunity for colleges and universities to better meet the challenge of offering higher educational opportunities to a heretofore untapped student population -- employees of Follow Through programs.

The training and career development components of Follow Through are required to provide the participant with a variety of training and staff development services. These services include:

- Pre-service and in-service training;
- Orientation activities for non-FT personnel working with FT;
- Career development planning;
- Provision for guidance and counseling;
- Provision for supplementary training; and,
- Provision for other educational opportunities, such as high school equivalency programs and vocational training programs.

> Supplementary Training is the academic subsection of the Career Development component of FT. Within the budget of FT programs, a category of funds has been specifically provided for this training, which is supplementary to other staff and career development training that may be provided.[1]

The career development portion of FT programs has been a significant addition. As of June 1977, it has been required in the implementation of all FT programs. Supplementary Training is a compensatory mechanism intended to heighten the recipients' opportunity for upward mobility, and, as a consequence, upgrade the economic, social, and educational prospects of their families.

[1] A Guide to Program Policy Management and Operation, U.S. Office of Education, Division of Follow Through, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1975, p. 2.

The rationale for the study arises from the need to provide a description of the program and of the progress of the students in Supplementary Training. The Office of Evaluation and Dissemination requested that information about Supplementary Training programs and participants be documented.

3.0 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

3.1 QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE FT/ST PROGRAMS

The broad areas of inquiry were prescribed as follows:

- Characteristics of participants in ST;
- Characteristics of the ST projects (i.e., administration); and,
- Characteristics of the training received.

The Office of Evaluation and Dissemination (OED) listed questions within each of the above characteristics which were to be addressed in the study. The questions, as stated by OED, were as follows:

A. Characteristics of participants in ST:

1. Names and educational levels of participants prior to training.
2. Number of years trainees were out of school prior to enrollment in ST.
3. Are trainees the parents of present and/or former FT children?
4. Are trainees who have completed ST between school years 1974-75 and 1977-78 now employed? Give employment history and current (occupational) status.
5. How many trainees, by sex, are/were single heads of households?
6. Changes in parental (trainee) attitudes toward their education, and attitudinal changes in their children toward education.

7. Relationship of trainees to projects:

   a. Prior to participating in ST, how long had trainee(s) been associated with Follow Through? In what capacity? Give detailed particulars.

   b. During and after the training period, what is/was the nature of the association between trainee(s) and the FT project?

B. Characteristics of the ST projects (i.e., administration):

   1. Total amount of funds expended for ST, by year.

   2. Total number of participants in ST, by year.

   3. Criteria used for selecting trainees.

   4. Administrative mechanism used for funding (e.g., vouchers to students, contract with IHE, etc.).

   5. Number and reason(s) for drop-out or termination of trainees. Give detailed particulars.

   6. Placement of responsibility for monitoring the progress of trainees in ST (e.g., special staff personnel, Project Director, etc.).

C. Characteristics of the training received.

   1. Number of semester, or quarter, hours earned by trainee.

   2. Degree(s) received, subject matter field, dates of enrollment, and/or graduation.

   3. Names and descriptions of training facilities, degrees offered.

   4. Relationship (if any) of type of training to FT program.

   5. Cost per applicant by item (books, tuition, transportation, etc.).

6. Cost per credit hour earned.

7. Variations in the type of training offered for ST participants and that of a regular program offered by institutions providing the training, if any.

The method of data collection that would be responsive to these questions was also presented and defined by OED. Rehab's proposed procedures for accomplishing the study reflected the OED model. Some caution was registered by the project staff relative to potential difficulties. The potential difficulties foreseen were in locating past participants, and in securing rapid approval of forms from the Federal Education Data Acquisition Control office (FEDAC). Preliminary information gathering from records in the national FT/ST office in Washington, D.C. proved that, in actuality, there were minimal data available. Consistent and systematic documentation of information pertaining to the aforementioned areas of inquiry were not available. The anticipated problem in locating past program participants was compounded by a lack of information or clues as to how participants could be identified. Project staff had additional difficulty in gleaning descriptive information on individual projects (e.g., name of current project director, correct telephone number, college/university affiliation, etc.). These initial problems consumed a great deal of time and subsequently delayed development of hypotheses. Therefore, interview questions could not be identified or developed due to either incomplete or unavailable data.

Two major modifications in the initial procedural plan were made: (1) The addition of a project information request form to accompany the project director's Interview Questionnaire, and (2) a concentration solely on the 1974-75 school year. The information form was added for the purpose of verifying the previously collected data, and collecting data that were unobtainable by examining the files. The decision to concentrate on the 1974-1975 school year was based on the fact that 1974 was the last year in which new enrollees were accepted into the ST programs. Coincidentally, it (1974) appeared to be a more detailed record-keeping year than each of the subsequent years for the period of the investigation (1974 through 1978).

Once modifications were implemented, the project staff proceeded to attempt to answer the questions initiated by OED.

4.0 METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

4.0 METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

4.1 QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The purpose of the study was to provide a description of the FT/ST program. Special attention was placed on describing participants' employment history, changes in economic status, and attitudes toward education.

In order to collect data that would provide the most appropriate information on the above characteristics, three questionnaires were required. The three types of questionnaires designed were:

- Project Director Questionnaire;
- Participant Questionnaire; and,
- In-Depth Interview Questionnaire.

4.1.1 Project Director Questionnaire

The Project Director Questionnaire (PDQ) was developed to (1) verify the accuracy of existing data, and (2) obtain project directors' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of their projects. The questionnaire contained a basic participant data form, a project characteristic verification form, and a section for project director assessment of attitudes concerning the FT/ST program. (See Appendix A.)

Prior to actual administration of the PDQ, project summaries, accompanied by an explanatory letter, were forwarded to the chief state school officers in those states representing the projects under study, and to the superintendents of those school systems where the FT/ST projects were in operation. The correspondence contained the following information:

1. The intent and scope of the study, and that it was being conducted under the authority of the DHEW/USOE;
2. That FT/ST project directors would be interviewed in order to obtain data regarding their individual projects; and,

3. That ST program participants would be interviewed without disrupting the daily classroom routine, or education of the children.

The project staff (interviewers) attempted to contact the 47 project directors by telephone to thoroughly explain the purpose of the study, to ascertain their willingness to participate, to advise them of the need to administer a telephone interview, and to advise them that materials (discussed below) would be mailed to them.

Interviewers further explained that the telephone interview would last approximately ten minutes, and asked if it was convenient to administer it at that time. Many preliminary calls were placed before interviews could be completed with project directors, but none refused to participate. Upon completion of the interviews, the directors were thanked for their time, effort, and cooperation and reminded that materials would be forthcoming.

Data gathered from the National Follow Through Division, in Washington, were recorded on Sections (1) and (2) of the Project Director Questionnaire. The Questionnaire was subsequently mailed to the 47 project directors for the purpose of data verification and/or correction. In many instances, however, data were unavailable at the FT national office, and project directors were requested to supply any missing information. Data collected from the project directors, particularly the identification of program participants, allowed the study to advance to the second stage, namely the interviewing of participants. (See Section 4.2.)

4.1.2 Participant Questionnaire

In developing the Participant Questionnaire, efforts were directed toward obtaining factual information from participants in the FT/ST program, and identifying patterns of success and failure that could be associated with program participation. The project staff believed that the most effective and efficient method for collecting this data would be through a telephone interview; however, an inherent problem in such a task lies in locating program participants.

Previous experience had shown that this type of survey must be straight-forward, concise, and limited in interview time. The Participant Questionnaire (see Appendix B) elicited educational information, socio-economic factors, demographic information, and participants' attitudes on the effectiveness of the program. The questionnaire utilized the multiple choice method of eliciting information, as well as open-ended items to allow the respondent to clarify or provide a rationale for his/her answer.

The section on attitudes asked questions the program participants identical to those asked project directors regarding the program's effectiveness. In both questionnaires, the following rating scale was employed: extremely effective, effective, less than effective, or not effective.

4.1.3 In-depth Interview Questionnaire

The purpose of this interview was to acquire more in-depth information about participant feelings toward the Follow Through/Supplementary Training program. Those participating in this interview were not asked to evaluate the FT/ST program. Rather, each person was requested to rate the positive impact that certain aspects of the program had on his/her life because of participation in the program.

Four broad areas were addressed in this interview:

- Program Administration;
- Academic/Educational Factors;
- Training Factors; and,
- Life Effects.

The in-depth interview questionnaire can be found in Appendix C.

4.2 SELECTION OF SAMPLING FRAME AND PRETEST OF INSTRUMENTS

Information on file in the National Follow Through Office indicated that 63 Supplementary Training projects were operational between the years 1974 and 1978. The information obtained from these files, along with a computer print-out listing of FT/ST projects nationwide, received from the Support Operations Branch, Grant and Procurement Management Division, USOE, yielded the following:

- Data for the study of 48 ST projects in operation during 1974 (new participants were not enrolled after 1974);*
- Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the 48 project directors whose projects were to be included in the study; and,
- Names of 682 participants believed to have been enrolled in FT/ST during 1974.

4.2.1 Distribution and Sizes of ST Projects

The projects ranged in size from one participant to 34 participants with a mean project size of 14. By geographical region, the projects were distributed as shown in Table 4-1.

*Several lists of ST projects were acquired from the national FT office. However, the years in which the projects were operational were not clear. When these lists were compared with the computer output listing of current ST projects made available from the USOE Grant and Procurement Division, it was found that, out of 63 listed projects: (1) Five programs on the original list were not operational between 1974 and 1978; and, (2) ten projects listed as Supplementary Training were, in fact, ST technical assistance grants to universities (reducing the total to 48). One of the 48 projects was subsequently eliminated from the sample, as it had enrolled only one participant.

Table 4-1. Regional Distribution of Supplementary Training Projects

Region	No. of Programs	No. of Participants	Mean Program Size
NE	18	280	15
SE	10	148	15
SW	9	112	12
NW	11	142	13
TOTALS	48	682	

Three survey samples were used:

A. All (48) ST project directors;

B. 200 ST program participants; and,

C. 40 ST program participants for in-depth interviewing.

Sample "A" requires no sampling plan, as it is a complete enumeration.

Samples "B" and "C" require sampling plans. These are described below.

4.2.2 Participant Sample

An initial sample of 200 ST participants was inflated by 50 percent for a total (n_0) of 300 in order to assure a final sample (N_1) of 200 after non-response. It was assumed that it would not be possible to contact all of the 200 in the initial sample, as some participants might have moved or died between the time of participation and the time of the study. Respondents were selected using a stratified random sampling technique. The stratification variable was program size, with a distribution between strata as shown in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2. Stratification of Sampling Frame

Stratum	Program Size (Number in Program)	Mean Number in Program	Number of Programs	Number of People	Percent of Total
Small	1-14	9.0	25	217	32
Medium	15-19	17.0	13	216	31
Large	20-34	23.5	10	249	37
TOTAL			48	682	100

The stratification process was applied for the following reasons:

- Sampling problems and program characteristics were expected to vary among sites;
- Dividing a heterogeneous population into more homogeneous subpopulations tends to increase precision and decrease variance;
- Ensuring that each individual has an equal probability of selection, while representing all programs in the sampling frame; and,
- Descriptive statistics for the overall ST program could be generated without recourse to weighting schemes.

The final sampling ratio was to be 200/682 = 0.29, although the inflated overall sampling ratio was 0.43. It was anticipated that a 43 percent sampling ratio would yield a representative sample of ST participants, and that the 29 percent final sampling ratio would be acceptable in view of anticipated bias.

The final number of respondents in the study was 195. They were distributed approximately equally by program size, as shown in Table 4-3. The percentage distribution shown in this table is very close to the percentage distribution, by program size, of the 682 participants, which is given in Table 4-2.

Table 4-3. Respondent Distribution by Program Size

Program Size Number in Program	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Small (1-14)	62	32
Medium (15-19)	64	33
Large (20-34)	69	35
TOTAL	195	100%

Table 4-4 shows the geographical distribution of the respondents. There were more respondents (as well as participants) in the northeast and southeast regions of the country than in the northwest and southwest.

Table 4-4. Respondent Geographical Distribution

Region	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
NE	67	34
SE	49	25
SW	40	21
NW	39	20
TOTAL	195	100%

The geographical distribution of the respondents, in terms of percents, fairly well matches with that of the 682 participants. As derived from Table 4-1, the 682 participants were geographically divided as follows: NE - 41 percent; SE - 22 percent; SW - 16 percent; NW - 21 percent.

4.2.3 In-Depth Sampling Plan

Sample "C" (the 40 respondents to be selected for in-depth interviews) was a combination of accessibility sampling (i.e., taking the most easily obtainable observations) and purposive samping (i.e., subjective choice in drawing what appears to be a representative sample). Limitations on time and finances

prevented taking a random sample of ten people from each region. As a result, a single location from each region was sought which had the property that ten respondents were in that location, or very nearby. In this sense, the in-depth sample was an accessibility sample. However, the location to be chosen had to be such that the various sized programs were in that location, or close to it. The participants were then chosen on the basis of being in a given-sized program, having certain characteristics, and what they had reported on the participant questionnaire. In this sense, the sampling was purposive.

From the stratified sample of 195 people, 40 people were selected for the in-depth questionnaire. The distributions by region and by program size are shown in Tables 4-5 and 4-6.

Table 4-5. In-Depth Sample by Geographical Distribution

Region	Number of Respondents
NE	10
SE	10
SW	10
NW	10
TOTAL	40

Table 4-6. In-Depth Sample by Program Size

Program Size	Number of Respondents
Small	9
Medium	17
Large	14
TOTAL	40

4.2.4 Pre-Test

Two Follow Through program sites were selected for pre-testing the data collection instruments. The tests were conducted in the manner which was employed in the full-scale study. An introductory telephone call was made to the project directors to: (1) explain the study, (2) ascertain consent, and (3) advise the Directors to expect the verification mail-out. A follow-up telephone call was then placed in order to: (1) verify the accuracy of the mail-out data, and (2) verbally complete the last two pages of the Project Director Questionnaire regarding the directors' attitudes.

The next phase of the pre-test was to conduct telephone interviews with nine ST participants, utilizing the ST Participants Questionnaire. Finally, on-site, in-depth interviews were conducted (via the In-Depth Interview Questionnaire) with four participants who had previously been interviewed by telephone.

4.3 PROCESSING OF THE DATA

Completed questionnaires were reviewed for completeness and accuracy. The information was then entered into on-line computer data files. These data files served as input to the computer programs which performed much of the statistical analysis. All computer work was performed on IBM 370 series machines, using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) language for OS/3670, Version H, Release 8.0. Additional test statistics were manually calculated from the SPSS tabulations of the questionnaire data.

5.0 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

To initiate the study, considerable background information was required. The presumed major sources for acquiring this information were the program staff in the National Office of Follow Through, and local project reports filed in the national office.

The kinds of background information thought to be required included the following:

- Which of the approximately 162 Follow Through projects, which were in operation during school year 1978-1979, had Supplementary Training components;
- Who were the project directors for the ST projects (names, addresses, phone numbers, etc.);
- How many persons were enrolled in ST projects, and how could they be contacted;
- What was the size and geographical distribution of ST projects; and,
- What were the college and university affiliates of each of the ST projects?

Acquiring this basic kind of information was critical, as it would dictate a plan of work and be used to determine how the study design (as outlined in the RFP) would be implemented. This first step of the study, prescribed by the RFP in Task 1 ("Preliminary Information Gathering") was stalled, for reasons which were, and remain, unknown to the contractor. Repeated attempts to develop a liaison with the Follow Through (FT) program staff failed.

Although efforts to meet with the Follow Through staff were initiated on September 30, 1978, it was October 26 before a meeting was held with a Follow Through staff member. As this staff person had not been officially designated as the liaison between FT and the contractor, it was not until mid-November that a list of current FT projects was made available to the contractor through the formally appointed FT liaison.

These difficulties were compounded when it was subsequently learned that most of the answers to the basic questions posed at the beginning of this section were not available from FT program staff. However, early in December, local FT project files were made available to the contractor so that the contractor's staff could ferret out the required information.

Detailed review of local FT project files revealed that, for the five year period which was to be studied, the only relevant available data was as follows:

- The names of most of the FT project directors (not necessarily current) whose projects included a Supplementary Training component;
- Names of ST participants (not all projects and not all five years for any project);
- Names of affiliated colleges and universities (not all projects); and,
- Credit hours earned by ST enrollees for 1974 (credit hour data for all other years was so sketchy as to be unusable).

In addition to the time lost in the pursuit of this information, the quality of the data was such that little, if anything, was learned about the structure and administration of ST projects. FT project directors would later be asked to supply much of this information.

In addition to the telephone interviews with FT project directors, forms were mailed to them (Appendix A, pp.1-4) which asked for much of the same information that was needed, but was not found, in the FT national office files. There was a non-response rate of 22% by FT project directors, in spite of their full (all 47 project directors) participation in the telephone interviews, conducted less than one week prior to their receipt of the written questionnaires. In addition, the responses received from project directors were incomplete, in the areas of program structure and administration, to a degree which rendered them useless.

It should be noted that this latter collapse in acquiring information was not the fault of the FT directors. In hindsight, it was apparent that the questionnaire design fell short of eliciting responses which would provide insight into ST project structure and administration. Insufficient data was sought and the language of the basic question on ST staff positions was not clear.

Following the mailing of the questionnaire to project directors, the director for this study received approximately eight long-distance telephone calls from questionnaire recipients. While other aspects of the study were occasionally mentioned, in every case the basic purpose of the call was the need for clarification of the question on ST staff positions (Appendix A, p.3, question No. 6).

As described in Section 3.1, there were three broad areas of inquiry prescribed for the study, reiterated as follows:

- Characteristics of participants in ST;
- Characteristics of the ST program (administration); and,
- Characteristics of supplementary training.

The limitations just described impacted most heavily on gaining insight into "characteristics of the ST program" (i.e. ST program administration).

The sampling design dictated program participant representation by geography and program size. However, since no further data are available regarding other characteristics of the entire population of program participants, there is no way of assuring that the sample is representative. It should be emphasized that incomplete knowledge of the sampling frame is a principal drawback in social science research.

Concerning the project directors, it is believed that virtually all were involved in the study. (It was earlier noted that one project director was omitted from the study because there was only one participant involved in the program.) Whether any others were missed is difficult to say, primarily because of inadequate records in the national FT office. Nevertheless, it is believed that the project director data very nearly results from a census survey.

A final comment on the sampling is in reference to "non-response bias" or non-sampling error. The original sample design specified 300 ST program participants in order to assure that 200 participants would be contacted. There is no way of assuring that the approximately 100 non-respondents are representative of either the sampled participants or the entire population of participants. However, the non-respondents and the respondents were distributed similarly by geography and program size.

A general fault with the questionnaire/interview techniques is that they tend to be retrospective. Because of this retrospection, memory errors may be introduced.

The focus of the study was to have been the Follow Through Supplementary Training Program. However, some results may have been contaminated because of confusing FT/ST with other programs. The confusing of FT with FT/ST would have had the most impact on the results of the study, particularly with regard to program costs. It does appear that some ST respondents and some project

directors did not make a distinction, in spite of efforts by the staff to get the respondents to deal only with FT/ST. Another program which may have been confused with FT/ST is the Head Start ST program.

In addition, several questions from the various questionnaires were not clear. The most notable of these were the questions concerning: a) FT/ST staff positions, on the Project Director Questionnaire, b) grade point average, on the Participant Questionnaire. Further, the question concerning the number of hours of college credit earned under ST is probably not something the respondents would easily remember.

6.0 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the findings of the study. Section 6.1 is concerned with the characteristics of the ST program. Section 6.2 describes socio-economic and other characteristics of the respondents. Section 6.3 describes attitudes of respondents and project directors concerning the ST program.

6.1 PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

In the original planning for the study, it was assumed that enrollment and funding information would be easily retrievable from records in the National Follow Through Office. However, this was not the case. Consequently, the enrollment figures for the five year period were compiled by reviewing various documents, and included determining enrollment from budget and per capita cost figures. All of these figures were subsequently verified (or modified) by FT project director responses.

Three sources were used to develop ST funding information. The first source consisted of Fiscal Year Funding Summaries, made available through the FT national office (Division of Follow Through). These summaries were the primary source for this data. This information was then checked against the second source, the USOE Grant and Procurement Report C2, a computer print-out made available by the Chief of the Support Operations Branch, USOE. These figures also appeared on the information form mailed to project directors, who were asked to verify their accuracy.* The project director responses constituted the third source.

Derived accordingly, the ST enrollment and funding figures for the five year period, 1974 through 1978, appear in Table 6-1.

*As worded in the project director information form (Appendix A), the directors were asked to verify funding data for only four of the five years being studied.

TABLE 6-1.

ST ENROLLMENT AND FUNDING HISTORY, 1974-1978

	NE	SE	SW	NW	TOTALS
1974					
ENROLLMENT	279	154	121	152	706
FUNDING (Nat'l Off.)	$183,779	$102,586	$74,812	$120,570	$481,747
Funding (Proj. Dir.)	FIGURES FOR THIS YEAR WERE NOT PRESENTED TO FT PROJECT DIRECTORS FOR VERIFICATION				
1975					
ENROLLMENT	218	130	93	140	581
FUNDING (Nat'l Off.)	$197,283	$101,152	$58,227	$126,038	$482,700
FUNDING (Proj. Dir.)	$119,934	$82,736	$42,723	$109,453	$354,846
1976					
ENROLLMENT	142	109	64	99	414
FUNDING (Nat'l Off.)	$108,540	$95,787	$42,023	$112,137	$358,487
FUNDING (Proj. Dir.)	$88,193	$81,735	$39,864	$108,577	$318,369
1977					
ENROLLMENT	113	92	49	77	331
FUNDING (Nat'l Off.)	$90,533	$83,569	$34,997	$85,671	$294,770
FUNDING (Proj. Dir.)	$90,603	$73,774	$21,315	$97,666	$283,358
1978					
ENROLLMENT	69	59	46	62	236
FUNDING (Nat'l Off.)	$76,940	$54,436	$28,536	$76,618	$236,530
FUNDING (Proj. Dir.)	$82,136	$67,788	$14,334	$69,768	$234,026

The project directors were also asked to verify (or supply) per capita costs for each of the school years 1974/75 through 1977/78, and to change any incorrect costs. The per capita costs were to include such items as tuition, books, and travel. Table 6-2 summarizes the per capita costs, as reported by the 36 (out of 47) returned questionnaires. Projects which were not funded were not used in computing the median per capita cost. (One project director noted that the courses offered under ST also served other paraprofessionals.)

TABLE 6-2.

ST PER CAPITA COSTS BY YEAR
(BASED ON 36 RESPONDENTS)

School Year	Median Per Capita Cost	Lowest Per Capita Cost	Highest Per Capita Cost	Projects Not Funded	No Response to Question
1974/75	$740	$141	$2000*	0	0
1975/76	$915	$140	$2211	3	1
1976/77	$855	$166	$1904	5**	1
1977/78	$857	$125	$3670***	6	2

*The figure does not include books or travel. This project received no funding during the following three years.

**One project was funded, but expended no funds.

***The project director wrote that this figure was in error, but did not indicate the correct figure. The next highest per capita cost for this school year school year was $1904.

There were a number of different educational models used in the Follow Through projects. Table 6-3 lists the models cited by the 36 (of 47) Project Directors.

TABLE 6-3

FT/ST MODEL EMPLOYED

Model	Number of Projects Using Model
Bank Street	4
Behavior Analysis - University of Kansas	1
Educational Development Center	1
Engleman Becker and Degree Program	1
Far West Laboratory	2
High Scope	2
Kansas City FT/ST Program	1
Mathemagenic Activities Program - University of Georgia	1
Responsive Education Program	1
Self Sponsored Models	3
Tucson Early Education Model	4
No Formal Model Implemented	2
No Specific Model - Based on Individual Student's Needs	1
Unknown	3
No Response to Question	9

Appendix D lists those colleges/universities affiliated with the projects. This is a partial listing, as it contains only those that were verified by the project directors. (Not all project directors returned questionnaires.)

6.1.1 Comments on Program Characteristics

In the initial planning for the study, it was thought that certain information for the study would be obtainable through the National Follow Through Office. Partial information was gathered, but its quality was such that little was learned about the structure and administration of the programs.

(Further discussion of this information gathering is in Section 5.0.) It was necessary to rely on the FT project directors to supply the information.

It had been assumed that the nonresponse rate for Project Directors would be about five percent. The portion of the Project Director Questionnaire which dealt with attitudes was conducted over the telephone. There was a 100 percent response for this section. However, there was less success with the mailed section, which contained the participant form and the project characteristics form.

Some said they did not have some of the information requested, that it had been sent to Washington, D.C. Follow-up calls were made to projects which had not returned the questionnaires. Sometimes, several calls were made to a single project in an attempt to get the questionnaire returned.

The final nonresponse rate was about 22 percent. However, some of the information from the responses was incomplete or suspect. Much of this lies with the questionnaire, and with the way some project directors view the relationship between FT and FT/ST.

The question on ST staff positions (Appendix A, page 3, question 6) was not clear. Roughly one-fourth of the returned questionnaires did not respond to the question. When there were responses, certain information sometimes was omitted (e.g., the credentials). For these reasons, the results of this question have been omitted from the report.

Some project directors appeared to make no distinction between FT and FT/ST. This could have an effect on the questions dealing with costs. Furthermore, sometimes costs were given which did not contain all the variables that had been asked for.

The figures on enrollment and funding, as reported in Table 6-1, may not be accurate. The national office funding figures were actually compiled from two different sources: a) the national office's list of programs, and b) the records from grants and procurements.

In summary, the little bit of information that was obtained concerning program characteristics must be skeptically viewed.

6.2 SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

A total of 195 persons were interviewed by telephone in order to gather the information necessary for this part of the study.

6.2.1 Racial Makeup of the Respondents

Racially, respondents were distributed as follows:

TABLE 6-4.

RACIAL DISTRIBUTION

Race	Percent Distribution	Number of Respondents
American Indian/Alaskan Native	4.1	8
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.6	5
Hispanic	10.8	21
Black, Non Hispanic	39.5	77
White, Non Hispanic	43.1	84
TOTAL	100%	195

6.2.2 Sex of Respondents

Virtually all the respondents were female, as is shown in Table 6-5.

TABLE 6-5.

RESPONDENT'S SEX

Sex	Percent Distribution	Number of Respondents
Male	2.1	4
Female	97.9	191
TOTAL	100%	195

6.2.3 Present Age of Respondents

At the time of this study, the median age of the respondents was 42 years.

6.2.4 Present Marital Status

The results of demographic questions on the survey showed 73 percent of the respondents were married, six percent of whom indicated that no spouse was present. Additionally, nine percent of the respondents were never married, three percent were widowed, and 15 percent divorced. The data is as follows:

TABLE 6-6.

PRESENT MARITAL STATUS

Status	No. of Respondents	Percent
Married (spouse present)	131	67.2%
Married (spouse not present)	11	5.6%
Never married	17	8.7%
Widowed	6	3.1%
Divorced	30	15.4%
TOTAL	195	100%

6.2.5 Current Household Membership

Two was the median number of children living in the respondents' households when this study was done. The following table shows the number of children living in each respondent's household.

TABLE 6-7.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD

Total Children in the Family	No. of Respondents Having This Many Children
0	22
1	33
2	60
3	46
4	14
5	15
6	2
7	2
Unknown	1
TOTAL	195

The ages of the children living in the respondents' households are given in the following table.

TABLE 6-8.

AGES OF CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD

Age of Child	No. of Respondents Having a Child This Age
5 or less	31
6-12	74
13-18	129
19 or older	64

Fifty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that at least one child had, at some time, been enrolled in the Follow Through program.

Some of the respondents (18 percent) indicated that persons other than the children were living in the household. Most of these "others" were either parents, or parents-in-law, of the participants.

Slightly over one-third (35.9 percent) of the respondents stated that they are the sole heads of their households.

6.2.6 Entry into the ST Program

Respondents reported that they started the program between 1966 and 1976, with most entering the program in 1970. (See Table 6-9.)

TABLE 6-9.

YEAR ENTERED ST PROGRAM

Year Started	No. of Respondents	Percent
1966	1	0.5
1967	6	3.1
1968	12	6.2
1969	27	13.8
1970	48	24.6
1971	43	22.1
1972	33	16.9
1973	12	6.2
1974	9	4.6
1975	3	1.5
1976	1	0.5
TOTAL	195	100%

Some concern is caused by several of the entering dates. Seven respondents said they entered the Follow Through ST program in 1966 or 1967. However, this program originated in 1968. It is possible that these persons made an error in the date, and that they actually entered after 1967. A second possibility is that they were originally in the Head Start ST program (which started before 1968) and had subsequently been shifted to the Follow Through ST (with the 1966 or 1967 date representing the year entering Head Start ST).

The second set of entry years, 1975 and 1976, cause concern because 1974 is supposed to have been the last year for new enrollees in this program.

It is difficult to say whether the responses in Table 6-9 actually represent the dates of entry into the FT/ST programs. Several dates have already been mentioned that may be wrong. Less obvious errors may have occurred if some persons became involved with FT at one time, and then became associated with FT/ST at a later date. Some respondents (and, for that matter, some project directors) apparently made no distinction between FT and FT/ST. If respondents gave the FT, rather than the FT/ST, date of entry, the errors would probably have gone undetected, in spite of the interviewers' efforts to consider only ST. Thus, one should approach the results with some caution.

In addition to considering the year in which the respondents entered the program, the study looked at how many years the respondents had been away from an academic setting before becoming involved in the ST program. Table 6-10 summarizes the results. However, for the same reasons as above, one must approach the results with some caution.

TABLE 6-10.

YEARS OUT OF SCHOOL BEFORE BEGINNING ST

Number of Years	Number of Respondents	Percent of Total Respondents
Less than 1 year	13	6.7
1-4	29	14.9
5-9	35	17.9
10-14	50	25.6
15 or more	68	34.9
TOTAL	195	100%

6.2.7 Changes in Education

Most of the respondents entered the ST program having completed high school. Some had a certain amount of work beyond high school. About 16 percent had not completed high school. Table 6-11 shows the respondents' educational backgrounds at the time of entry into the ST program.

TABLE 6-11.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND ON ENTRY TO ST PROGRAM

Last Grade Completed	No. of Respondents	Percent
K-8	2	1.0
9-11	30	15.4
High school graduate	123	63.1
Technical or business school	5	2.6
Less than 2 years college	28	14.4
More than 2 years college	3	1.5
College A.A. degree	1	0.5
Other	3	1.5
TOTAL	195	100%

Of the three listed as "Other," one had gone through nursing school and was a registered nurse. A second had a bachelor's degree, which was obtained while studying for the priesthood. The remaining one must have had at least a high school diploma, as there was an indication of college attendance.

TABLE 6-12.

PRESENT OR MOST ADVANCED COLLEGE STATUS

Status	No. of Respondents	Percent
Freshman	18*	9%
Sophomore	24	12%
Associate's Degree	4	2%
Junior	35	18%
Senior	25	13%
Bachelor's	77	39%
In Graduate School	7	4%
Master's	5	3%
TOTAL	195	100%

*One person listed here as being a freshman was just auditing the courses.

Some of those who said they were seniors were completing the requirements for the bachelor's degree during the semester in which the study was done. Of those who had received the bachelor's degree, some may have been doing graduate work but failed to mention it to the interviewer. (The questionnaire did not list being in graduate school as one of the choices. Those listed here as being in graduate school volunteered this information.)

Table 6-13 shows the number of semester hours that the respondents said they earned in the ST program.

TABLE 6-13.

SEMESTER HOURS RESPONDENTS SAID WERE EARNED IN ST PROGRAM

Hours Earned	No. of Respondents	Percent
0-15	10	5.1
16-30	12	6.2
31-45	13	6.7
46-60	14	7.2
61-75	18	9.2
76-90	15	7.7
91-105	13	6.7
106-120	34	17.4
121-135	44	22.6
More than 135	3	1.5
Unknown	19	9.7
TOTAL	195	100%

About 65 percent of the respondents indicated earning over 60 credit hours of college work through the ST program. However, a number of the respondents were not certain of how many hours they had actually gained through the ST program, so that some of the figures given were only estimates. In addition, there were some people who earned credit through ST, left the program, but continued taking college work on their own. The intent of the question was to determine not how much college work had been done, but rather how much had been done through ST.

Not all the college credit was earned in the traditional college classroom setting. Some of it was gained for life experience.

Table 6-14 hows the number of college credits earned in the ST program in relation to the respondent's educational background prior to entry in the ST program.

TABLE 6-14.

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND VS. SEMESTER HOURS EARNED

	0-15	16-30	31-45	46-60	61-75	76-90	91-105	106-120	121-135	More Than 135	Unknown
X-8			1	1							
9-11		1	2	1	4	4	2	8	6		2
H.S. Grad.	8	7	9	9	12	8	9	20	28	1	12
Tech. or Bus.				1				1	3		
< 2 Yr. Coll.		2	1		2	3	2	5	7	2	4
> 2 Yr. Coll.	1			1							1
A.A. Degree		1									
Other	1	1		1							

6-14

6.2.8 Current Standing in the ST Program

When asked, "Are you presently participating in the program," 63 of the 195 respondents (32 percent) indicated that they were, with the remaining 132 indicating they were not. However, of these 63 who said they were participating in the program, twelve had at least a bachelors degree. Eight of the twelve were employed as full time teachers, and one of the twelve was involved in administering an associates degree program. The remaining three were working as aides. It is quite likely that most, perhaps all, of these twelve people interpreted the questions as meaning participating in the Follow Through program, as opposed to participating in ST. (This would not be unexpected, since even some project directors made no distinction between FT and FT/ST.)

Fifty-one of the 63 respondents who said they were currently participating in the program had less than a bachelors degree. The number in each academic classification is given in Table 6-15.

TABLE 6-15.

CURRENTLY PARTICIPATING
(LESS THAN BACHELOR'S DEGREE)

	Number Participating	Number in Sample
Freshman	4	18
Sophomore	13	24
AA	2	4
Junior	15	35
Senior	17	25

There were 132 respondents who said they were no longer in the program. Table 6-16 shows the reasons stated by those who had at least a bachelor's degree.

TABLE 6-16.

REASONS FOR LEAVING ST PROGRAM
(AT LEAST A BACHELOR'S DEGREE)

	Bachelors	In Graduate School	Masters
Graduated	56	6	1
Program Terminated	5	1	0
Get Degree Sooner	1	0	1
Moved	0	0	1
Health	2	0	0
Family Responsibility (including maternity)	2	0	0
No FT Jobs (found regular teaching job)	1	0	0

As can be seen, the largest number of those with at least a bachelor's degree left the program because they graduated. The next largest number cited termination of the program as the reason for their leaving. These people may, however, have confused FT and FT/ST.

The reasons given for leaving the program that were given by those who had less than a bachelor's degree are given in Table 6-17.

TABLE 6-17.

REASONS FOR LEAVING ST PROGRAM
(LESS THAN BACHELOR'S DEGREE)

	NUMBER OF TERMINATIONS					
	FRESH	SOPH	AA	JR	SR	TOTAL
Maternity	1	1	0	1	0	3
Family Responsibilities (Children)	1	1	0	0	1	3
Physical Problems (Health)	1	3	0	3	2	9
No Money	0	0	0	3	1	4
Different Job	4	1	0	1	2	8
Home Pressure	3	1	0	1	0	5
Program Cuts/Termination*	0	1	0	6	1	8
Went to Other Program	0	2	0	1	0	3
Disliked College	0	0	0	1	0	1
Transportation Problems	2	0	1	2	0	5
Could Not Return to Program	1	0	0	0	0	1
Bilingual Requirement Imposed	1	0	0	0	0	1
Graduated (AA)	0	0	0	0	1	1
No Answer	0	1	1	1	0	3
TOTAL	14	11	2	20	8	55

*Included here are budget cuts for FT which then made the person ineligible for ST (fewer teacher aides; phasing out parent coordinator).

The three reasons most often mentioned for leaving were: physical problems (health), taking a different job, and program cuts/termination. One person who left to take a different job cited the current surplus of teachers as the reason. The senior who said , "Graduated (AA)," is going to school part-time now, using her own funds, and expects to graduate in 1981.

Table 6-18 shows the intentions of returning of those who had less than a bachelor's degree and were not participating.

TABLE 6-18.

INTENTION OF RETURNING
(CURRENTLY NOT PARTICIPATING)

	FRESH	SOPH	AA	JR	SR
Yes	6*	3	1	9**	2
No	7	7***		11	6
No Answer	1	1	1		

*One participant was trying to get back at the time of the interview; two said maybe; one said maybe, though not likely; one said yes, if the position and the money were available; the remaining participant just answered yes.

**One participant said she would like to return but could not afford it.

***One participant said that although she did not intend to return, she would like to return.

Some of those who said they did not intend to return did so because there was no longer a program. One of these, a senior, was hoping to complete the degree on her own.

6.2.9 Fields of Study

With regard to the courses of study, two types of programs exist: "Cluster" and "non-cluster." In the "cluster" programs, all ST students take courses together. These courses are often designed especially for ST participants. In the "non-cluster" programs, students select their major courses of study and their particular coursework from standard college offerings. Additionally, in the earlier years of the ST program, students were limited to majors in education only. The "cluster" effect and this early mandate may account for the fact that 83 percent of all students majored in education or educational technology. An additional eight percent of all ST participants majored in psychology or one of the social sciences. Table 6-19 shows the major fields of study of the respondents at the time they began the ST program.

TABLE 6-19.

FIELDS OF STUDY WHEN PARTICIPANT STARTED ST

Major Field	No. of Respondents	Percent
Area Studies	5	2.6
Business and Management	1	0.5
Education	153	78.5
English	1	0.5
Foreign Languages	1	0.5
Home Economics	1	0.5
Mathematics	1	0.5
Psychology	3	1.5
Public Affairs and Services	2	1.0
Social Sciences	10	5.1
Interdisciplinary	6	3.1
Education Technologies	9	4.6
No Major	2	1.0
TOTAL	195	100%

(A more detailed description of these major fields can be found in the Participant Questionnaire, Appendix A.)

Only 12 percent of all students changed their majors during their course of study. Most went to either education or social work. Furthermore, some simply went from one specialization of education to another specialization in education, e.g., changing from early childhood education to special education.

6.2.10 Changes in Employment Status

Analysis of employment status revealed that slightly more than one-half of the respondents were employed either full-time or part-time prior to ST participation. Table 6-20 shows the respondent's employment status when they entered ST.

TABLE 6-20.
EMPLOYMENT STATUS ON ENTERING ST

Status	No. of Respondents	Percent
Employed Full-Time	89	45.6
Employed Part-Time	22	11.3
Unemployed	29	14.9
Housewife	55	28.2
TOTAL	195	100%

Of the 112 who said they were employed full-time or part-time prior to ST participation, 54 were employed in capacities such as teacher's aides or FT parent educators. (Further discussion of the type of employment is in Section 6.3.11.)

The respondents were also asked about their employment status at the time of the interview. The question regarding current employment status made no distinction between full-time and part-time employment, nor did it give "housewife" as an option. If the "housewife" option been available some of those who chose "unemployed" might have instead chosen "housewife." Table 6-21 summarizes the respondents' employment status at the time of the interview.

TABLE 6-21.
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Status	No. of Respondents	Percent
Employed	182	93.3
Unemployed (seeking work)	4	2.1
Unemployed (not seeking work)	9*	4.6
TOTAL	195	100%

*Of the nine who were unemployed and not seeking work, six indicated their reasons. One was retired, another was undergoing chemotherapy, and a third was taking care of ill parents. An additional three had had children. (One of these three has a full-time job after returning from maternity leave.)

The table shows that nearly all of the respondents were employed at the time the survey was done. Of those who had said they were housewives or unemployed prior to ST, most said they were currently employed. For example, 29 respondents said they were unemployed prior to ST. Of this group, 28 said they were currently employed, and one is currently unemployed and not seeking work. Table 6-22 shows the pre-ST employment status in relation to the current employment status.

TABLE 6-22.
PRE-ST EMPLOYMENT STATUS VS. CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

		Current		
		Employed	Unemployed Seeking Work	Unemployed Not Seeking Work
Pre-ST	Employed Full-Time (89 people)	81	2	6
	Employed Part-Time (22 people)	22	0	0
	Unemployed (29 people)	28	0	1
	Housewife (55 people)	51	2	2

Much of the employment for those who previously were unemployed or were housewives is in positions such as teachers' aides or parent educators. Nevertheless, there was a dramatic status change among those who previously were housewives or were unemployed.

6.2.11 Changes in Type of Employment

In the previous section, brief remarks were made about the nature of the respondents' employment, both before ST and at the time of the interview. In this section, we will look at the specific jobs in which the respondents were working, both when they entered ST and when they were interviewed.

The tables have been organized on the basis of the respondent's highest academic status. The pre-ST employment status has been cross-tabulated with current employment data. The sum of the entries of a given row in a table indicates the number of people who were employed in that capacity when they entered ST. For example, in Table 6-23, the sum of the row marked "housewife" is 7 (3+2+2), indicating that seven respondents said they were housewives when they began ST. Similarly, the sum of the entries in a given column indicates the number of people who were employed in that capacity at the time of the interview. (Only non-zero entries appear in the tables.) It should be noted that non-respondents might have substantially biased the "change of employment" findings.

TABLE 6-23.

PRE-ST JOB VS. CURRENT JOB
(ACADEMIC STATUS: FRESHMAN)

Pre-ST	Current Job: Teacher Aide/Assistant; Home School Aide	Secretarial Clerical	Clerk; Cook; Mail Carrier	Medical Assistant	Unemployed Seeking Work	Unemployed Not Seeking Work
Housewife	3		2		2	
Teacher Aide/Assistant; Home School Aide	3	1				1
Secretarial; Clerical		1				
Cashier; Sitter; Maid	1		1	1		
Unemployed	2					

TABLE 6-24.

PRE-ST JOB VS. CURRENT
(ACADEMIC STATUS: SOPHOMORE)

	Current Job					
Pre-ST	Teacher Aide/Assistant; Paraprofessional; Parent Ed.; FT Assoc.	Secretarial; Clerical	Clerk/ Buyer	Soc. Work Aide; Deseg. Aide	Unemployed Seeking	Unemployed Not Seeking
Housewife	6		1			1*
Teacher Aide/Assistant; Paraprofessional; Parent Ed.; FT Assoc.	2					
Medical Aide	2					
Factory Worker	1				1	
Secretarial; Clerical		1				
Furniture Polisher; Bin Loader; Cashier; Cook	4					
Teen Counselor	1					
Unemployed	1	1		2		

*Had child

TABLE 6-25.

PRE-ST JOB VS. CURRENT JOB
(ACADEMIC STATUS: AA DEGREE)

Pre-ST	Current Job: Teacher Aide/Assistant; Parent Aide
Housewife	1
Teacher Aide/Assistant; Parent Aide	2
Cook	1

TABLE 6-26.

PRE-ST JOB VS. CURRENT JOB
(ACADEMIC STATUS: JUNIOR)

Pre-ST	Current Job: Teacher Aide/Asst.; Paraprofessional;	Secretarial; Clerical	Unemployed Not Seeking
Housewife	8	1	1*
Teacher Aide/Assistant; Paraprofessional; Parent Coor./Ed.	3	2	1
Factory Worker	1		1**
Sales Clerk; Cashier; Cook	3		
Medical Assistant	1		
Secretarial; Clerical	1		
Community Organizer	1		
Unemployed	9		

*Undergoing chemotherapy
**Retired

TABLE 6-27.

PRE-ST JOB VS. CURRENT JOB
(ACADEMIC STATUS: SENIOR)

Pre-ST	Current Job: Teacher Aide/Asst.; Paraprofessional; FT Assoc.; Family Coor.; Parent Coor.	Social Worker	Day Care Provider	Manager of Business	Medical Assistant
Housewife	8		1		
Nurse; Medical Assistant	1	1			
Teacher Aide/Assistant; Paraprofessional; Parent Coor.	2			1	
Secretarial; Clerical	1				
Factory Worker	2				
Clerk; Cook; Domestic; Crossing Guard	3				1
Bus Supervisor	1				
Family Worker	1				
Unemployed	2				

TABLE 6-28.

PRE-ST JOB VS. CURRENT JOB
(ACADEMIC STATUS: BACHELOR'S DEGREE)

Pre-ST	Current Job: Teacher	Teacher Aide/Asst.; Asst. Teacher	Substitute Teacher	Director of Degree Program	Secretarial; Clerical	Bookkeeper	Social Worker	Manager of Business	Family Worker	Community Relations Specialist	Unemp. Seeking	Unemp. Not Seeking
Housewife	12	2	1			1						
Teacher	1											
Tchr. Aide/Asst.; Paraprofessional; Parent Ed.	17	8		1	1		1	1				2*
Subst. Tchr.	1											
Medical Asst.	2											
Clerical	1	1										
Social Worker	1											
Clerk; Cook; Laundry Worker; Maid; Sitter; Elevator Oper.	4	2	1				1				1	
Family Worker									1			
Legal Aide										1		
Factory Worker	2											
Unemp. (Student)	2											
Unemp.	2	3**	2									1***

*Parents are ill
**One of these three has a full time teaching job during the next academic year
***Had a child

TABLE 6-29.

PRE-ST JOB VS. CURRENT JOB
(ACADEMIC STATUS: IN GRADUATE SCHOOL)

	Current Job		
	Teacher	Teacher Assistant; Inst. Aide	Unemployed Not Seeking
Pre-ST			
Housewife	1	1	
Teacher Aide	3		1*
Unemployed		1	

*On a one year maternity leave; has full-time position on return

TABLE 6-30.

PRE-ST JOB VS. CURRENT JOB
(ACADEMIC STATUS: MASTER'S DEGREE)

	Current Job
	Teacher
Pre-ST	
Housewife	2
Data Tech.	1
Secretary	1
Unemployed	1

A large number of those who were employed prior to ST were in capacities such as teacher aides, teacher assistants, and parent educators. Among those who said they were currently employed and had less than a bachelor's degree, nearly all were employed as teacher aides, teacher assistants, parent educators, and FT associates.

Among those who were employed and had at least a bachelor's degree, most were working as teachers. Some who had at least a bachelor's degree were working as teacher aides, teacher assistants, or assistant teachers. Some in this group chose to remain in this type of position, preferring the role of assistant to that of teacher. Several others were working as aides or assistants because there were no full-time positions available.

6.2.12 Changes in Type of Housing

Prior to training, most participants (74 percent) lived in houses, as opposed to apartments (24 percent). Subsequent to training, the number of persons residing in houses increased to more than 86 percent. (See Table 6-31).

TABLE 6-31.

TYPE OF HOUSING

	Pre-ST		Current	
Type	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent
Apartment	46	23.6	27	13.8
House	144	73.8	167	85.6
Other	4	2.1	1	0.5
No Answer	1	0.5	—	—
TOTAL	195	100%	195	100%

6.2.13 Changes in Own/Rent

Further insight has been gleaned from an own/rent analysis of participants. (See Table 6-32). It is entirely possible that apartment dwellers who now are

house dwellers are renting their houses, implying only a slight change in economic status. An analysis of the own/rent distribution of participants reveals that, prior to ST, nearly one-half rented, while the other half owned their domiciles. Subsequent to ST, however, exactly one-half of the former renters now own homes, increasing the "owner" proportion to nearly 3/4 of all participants.

TABLE 6-32.

RENT VS. OWN

	Pre-ST		Current	
	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent
Rent	92	47.2	55	28.2
Own	97	49.7	137	70.3
No Answer	6	3.1	3	1.5
TOTAL	195	100%	195	100%

6.2.14 Changes in Personal Income

Another finding is in the change in personal income levels. (See Table 5-33.) Prior to ST, nearly one-fifth of the participants reported "no personal income" whatsoever. Almost one-half reported annual personal income of less than $5,000, and an additional one-fifth earned between $5,000 and $9,999. Subsequent to training, more than one-third were reporting personal yearly earnings in excess of $10,000, with only two persons reporting "no personal income," and, only 14 percent with income less than $5,000. Approximately one-half were earning from $5,000 - $9,999. It should be mentioned that this income analysis does not account for the impact of inflation over the period in question.

Special note should be made that respondents were asked about their own personal income, and not that of their family, thus precluding the income of a spouse as an alternative variable with which to explain the increase in income.

The source of much of this current income, particularly those with less than a bachelor's degree, comes from teacher aides, paraprofessionals, or FT Parent Education. Further, some of those who were employed prior to ST were employed in these same types of positions.

TABLE 6-33.

PERSONAL INCOME

	Pre-ST		Current	
Income	No. of Respondents	Percent	No. of Respondents	Percent
No income	36	18.5	2	1.0
4,999 or less	88	45.1	28	14.4
5,000-9,999	36	18.5	90	46.2
10,000-14,999	2	1.0	59	30.3
15,000-19,999			5	2.6
20,000+			1	0.5
No answer	33	16.9	10	5.1
TOTAL	195	100%	195	100%

6.2.15 Academic Success (G.P.A.)

In the study, the variable "Academic Success" was to be measured by the use of the grade point average (G.P.A.). To get this data, Question 12 of Part 1 on the Participant Questionnaire asked, "What was your most recent grade point average for the ST program," with an interviewer note which said, "for those respondents that have terminated, ask what their grade point average was before leaving the program." While data was gathered for this variable, there are a number of problems in interpreting the result.

First, the question failed to specify whether the G.P.A. was to have been the G.P.A. for only that one semester, or the overall G.P.A. through that semester. Secondly, the questionnaire failed to ask what the grading scale was, i.e., was it a three point grading scale (A=3.00), a four point grading scale (A=4.0), a five point grade scale (A=5.00), or something else.

Thirdly, a number of respondents were not sure of their G.P.A.'s and hazarded a guess. Of the 195 respondents, 11 did not know and did not guess. Two took the courses on a pass/fail basis, and one was only auditing the courses.

Because of these problems, analysis on grade point average has not been performed.

6.3 ATTITUDES

This section describes and compares aggregate attitudes of both participants and directors, and describes the results of the in-depth attitudinal questionnaire for a sub-sample of the participants.

6.3.1 Attitudes of Participants and Project Directors

The first level of attitudinal analyses of participants revealed very favorable opinions on the effectiveness of the programs. With the exception of the category "effectiveness of providing services" (e.g., tutoring, counseling), 90 percent or more of the respondents rated the program as "effective" or better. Table 6-34 shows the participants' responses.

TABLE 6-34.

PARTICIPANT RATINGS OF ST PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Aspect	Percent Distribution					TOTAL
	Extremely Effective	Effective	Less Than Effective	Not Effective	Total Percent	Respondents
Effect on career development	73	24	2	1	100	194
Effect of specific training experience	68	28	3	1	100	195
Effect of providing services	41	37	13	9	100	193
Effect of additional education	78	15	5	2	100	195
Effect improving childs attitudes towards education	61	30	5	4	100	179
Effect meeting specific needs	59	36	4	2	100	195
Effect Overall	66	28	5	1	100	194

Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding

Table 6-35 shows how the project directors rated the effectiveness of the programs. They, like the participants, felt the programs were effective. Furthermore, a comparison of participant ratings with the ratings by the project directors on those same aspects, shows the two groups to have had nearly identical opinions.

TABLE 6-35.

PROJECT DIRECTOR RATINGS OF ST PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Aspect	Percent Distribution					TOTAL
	Extremely Effective	Effective	Less Than Effective	Not Effective	Total Percent	Respondents
Effect on career development	66	34	0	0	100	47
Effect of specific training experience	72	28	0	0	100	47
Effect of providing services	43	38	19	0	100	47
Effect of additional education	81	19	0	0	100	47
Effect improving child's attitudes towards education	57	43	0	0	100	44
Effect meeting specific needs	40	49	11	0	100	45
Effect Overall	66	34	0	0	100	47

Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding.

The next level of analysis concerning the effectiveness of the programs dealt with trying to identify which of the various aspects of the programs (such as providing services) were perceived as having been most successful and least successful. For each participant's response, the following numerical assignments were made to the four classifications of effectiveness:

- 4 - extremely effective
- 3 - effective
- 2 - less than effective
- 1 - not effective

Aspect mean scores for participants and for the project directors were then computed and are shown in Table 6-36.

TABLE 6-36.

PARTICIPANT AND PROJECT DIRECTOR MEAN SCORES AND RANKS ON PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

	Participants		Project Director	
	Mean Score	Rank	Mean Score	Rank
Effect Career Development	3.69	2	3.66	4
Effect Spec. Train. Exp.	3.63	3	3.72	2
Effect Prov. Services	3.10	7	3.23	7
Effect Add Education	3.70	1	3.81	1
Effect Imp. Child Att.	3.48	6	3.66	4
Effect Mtg. Special Needs	3.51	5	3.29	6
Effect Overall	3.59	4	3.66	4

Here, rank 1 indicates highest effectiveness, while rank 7 indicates least effectiveness. The rankings seem to indicate that both participants and project directors feel that the additional education (beyond high school) as a means of improving the participants' income status was the most successful part of the program. They also seem to agree that the providing of services (e.g., tutoring, counseling, advisement) to help the participant academically succeed was the least successful part of the program. There was also agreement concerning the ranking of "overall effectiveness."

The remaining four aspects received different rankings from the participants and project directors. Nevertheless, there appears to be an overall positive correlation between the two sets of rankings. This hypothesis was tested, using the Spearman rank correlation coefficient. The calculated Spearman value was .82, which is significant at the .05 level, thus indicating a positive correlation between the two sets of rankings.

Chi-square tests were performed to determine if the attitude toward a given aspect was independent of a) geographical region and b) program size. With the 0.05 significance level, it was found that attitude was not dependent either on geographical region or on program size. (Calculations are contained in the separate computer printouts.)

6.3.2 Attitudes from the In-Depth Study

While the overall impression of the respondents was favorable, respondents sometimes indicated negative attitudes. These negative results prompted an examination of attitudinal data collected from the in-depth questionnaire.

This detailed analysis showed that most participants regarded both their own objectives and those of the program as having been met. Only in a few cases was the disagreement notable. About 30 percent of the respondents felt that the ST program did not help them to get a degree in less time. About 40 percent responded that the program did not help them get release time from work to attend classes. About 40 percent reported that they were not effectively informed about the resources the college had to offer. About 25 percent felt that teachers did not have positive attitudes about the career advancement of participants and about the program in general. About 25 percent mentioned a fear of job loss if they remained a full-time program participant. These latter discrepancies reveal areas of further emphasis in improving the structure of programs. Whether or not they have significant effects on outcomes was not tested. Table 6-37 summarizes the results from the in-depth questionnaire.

TABLE 6-37.

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

	No. of Respondents				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer
A. Program Administration					
1. Inform Instructors of Student Needs	11	19	8		2
2. Coordinate with College Registrar	8	26	4		2
3. Program Spoke Out to College	16	15	5		4
4. Program Spoke Out to Local School	13	18	6	1	2
5. CDC and Program Administration Worked Well	8	21	6	1	4
6. Opportunies for Participant Planning	16	17	6	1	
7. Program Objectives Carried Out	13	21	2	1	3
8. Qualified Staff	10	27	2	2	
B. Academic Factors					
1. Helped Plan Course Schedule	12	17	8	1	2
2. Get Degree in Less Time	12	14	8	4	2
3. Individually Tailored Curriculum	11	22	6		1
4. Helped Get Release Time	13	9	10	6	2
5. Counseling for Career Plans	12	22	3	2	1
6. Helped with Registration	20	16	2	1	1
7. Helped with Special Arrangements	13	17	7		3
8. Information on College Resources	7	13	17	1	2

TABLE 6-37.

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW (CONT'D)

	No. of Respondents				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer
9. Provided Support to Students	19	18	2	1	
10. Helped Achieve Academic Objective	16	23	1		
C. Training					
1. P.S. Tchrs. Positive RE Trainee Advance	10	14	10	4	2
2. No Job Loss Fear if Full-Time	8	11	8	7	6
3. P.S. Admin. Positive regarding Trainee Advance	16	18	3	2	1
4. P.S. Tchrs. Positive About ST	7	17	12	2	2
5. Found Job at End of Training	4	15	11	4	6
6. ST Training Rewarding	25	14	1		
7. Staff Monitored Training	12	23	3	1	1
8. Trainee Input	9	24	7		
D. Life Effects					
1. Increased Income	21	18		1	
2. Positive Effect on Child Attitude	14	15	4	1	6
3. Qualify for Better Job	18	18	3		1
4. Improved Attitude Toward Education	21	12	4	1	2

Chi-square tests were performed to determine if attitude toward a given aspect of the program was independent of a) geographical region and b) program size. With the 0.05 level of significance, significant differences were found in twenty-two instances. (The calculations are in the separate computer print-out.) However, in eleven of these cases, the differences primarily existed in choosing "Strongly Agree" as opposed to "Agree" (with virtually no "Disagrees").

Of the remaining eleven instances, eight showed attitudes dependent on geographical region. These were in regard to: participant planning, release time, getting degree in less time, special arrangements, information on college resources, public school teacher positiveness toward trainee advancement, having no fear of job loss, and public school teacher positiveness toward ST. In virtually all instances, respondents from the northwest tended to have lower opinions on the given aspects of their programs, than did respondents from the other three regions.

The remaining three instances showed dependence on program size. They were in regard to information on college resources, teacher positiveness toward ST, and getting a degree in less time. Those in the small programs had the best responses toward teacher positiveness, whereas those in the larger programs gave the most favorable responses to the other two aspects.

In summary, the respondents had an overall favorable impression of both the program and its various aspects. More dissatisfaction emerged from the in-depth interview, but on no aspect did the negative opinions outweigh the positive opinions. Thus, while some aspects might need improvement, the ST program does seem to be functioning effectively in the eyes of the participants.

7.0 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

If one considers the background of the ST participants, it would be easy to characterize them as being high risks as college students. Most participants were: (1) persons who had completed high school ten years before enrolling in ST, (2) considerably older than the usual college student, (3) mothers, (4) sole heads of households, (5) of low income, and (6) members of racial minorities.

Limited use of learning tools and skills over a protracted period, child rearing responsibilities, and financial pressures are not usually included in a profile of those who successfully attend higher education institutions. Furthermore, these attributes are not precursors of upward mobility in the job market.

With this background in mind, let us now look at some generalizations which can be made from the findings of the study. The study results showed that, subsequent to ST, the participants:

- Were successful in increasing their level of education;
- Experienced a higher rate of employment;
- Effectively improved their economic status through displaying upward job mobiity; and,
- Increased their personal income.

Moreover, the study results disclosed that:

- Participant terminations from ST were not associated with participants' perceptions of program effectiveness; and,
- Participants' and project directors' attitudes about ST program effectiveness agreed in their high level of "positiveness."

Because of the study's experimental design, it is not possible to attribute these changes to the ST program. In fact, some may be attributable to the FT program. Nevertheless, the ST program probably gave many participants the chance to attend college, a chance they might not have had otherwise. Thus, the ST program was probably a factor in the participants' improved socio-economic status, although it is not possible to say how much of a factor. For many respondents, particularly those who received a bachelor's degree, the ST program was viewed as the major contributor to their improved status. It was not uncommon for one of them to volunteer a statement such as, "I would not be where I am today without ST."

For those with less than a bachelor's degree, the Follow Through program was a major element in some of the changes which took place. Frequently, the higher employment rate and personal income were the result of being employed in positions such as teacher aide, FT Associate, or FT Parent Educator. (Many of these people were previously unemployed or housewives.)

An interesting finding was the large percent in the sample who had graduated (i.e., had a bachelor's degree). If the survey had been done several months later with the same sample, the percentage of graduates would have been larger, since several of those listed here as seniors were completing their final semester.

It is possible that the sampling process biased the results. Those who were more successful may have been the easiest to contact. Further, the substituting for nonresponses may have yielded respondents whose characteristics were more like the previously obtained respondents (i.e., the more successful ones) and less like the nonrespondents.

If one assumes that these 89 graduates were the only graduates out of the 680 participants, this would be fourteen percent graduations. However, there were others who had graduated who were not included in the sample. (Some Project Directors supplied information about participants who were not in the sample.) Further, others are nearing graduation, so that the actual percent of graduations will be larger, and should, in fact, increase in the next several years. Some will be people who are no longer with the ST program.

At the time of the interviews, some of the graduates were working as teacher aides, teacher assistants, or instructional aides. Some of these people preferred this type of position over that of being a teacher. However, others were quite outspoken and bitter about this status, since they were certified as teachers. Considerable anger was directed toward local school administrators for what these respondents believed were unfulfilled promises of bona fide teaching positions. The respondents said that no vacancy had been filled by an ST graduate, that none of those in their ST program had risen above the level of instructional assistant.

One respondent, a certified teacher, said that the local school district did not allow persons with degrees to serve as teacher aides. Unable to find a teaching position and not permitted to work as an aide, she was unemployed at the time of the study.

One of many questions raised by this issue is why so many participants chose careers in education, particularly in view of the teacher surplus. Although many participants commented about the options, or lack of options, they had in selecting their major fields of study, the degree to which individual choices were permissible is not clear. Some participants reported that it was required by their local project that their college course work be in education. Moreover, some respondents said that participation in ST was mandatory as a condition of continued employment as FT aides.

Another factor worth noting concerns the role playing by each FT project's Career Development Committee (CDC), whose function is to provide direction and initiative for the career development of local paraprofessionals through ST. Almost three quarters of the in-depth interview respondents agreed (or strongly agreed) with the statement that "the Career Development Committee and the program administration worked well together." Yet many participants commented that their CDC's had not met for years. It would certainly appear that, if a teacher surplus existed, this fact would be known to CDC's, as it impacted the local areas.

There is the question of how well prepared ST graduates were for taking up roles as professional teachers. During the study, many participants mentioned that in their particular ST programs, all ST participants as a group took the same college courses. This grouping, known as a "cluster," was said to have the curricula and courses specifically tailored for the participants.

Comments by many participants indicated that the special course work required of participants in "cluster" arrangements with universities was much less demanding as compared to that of "non-cluster" and non-ST students. It was for this very reason that many participants stated that at some point they deserted their "cluster" (while remaining as ST students) to pursue their education on an individual basis.

Thus, the clustering processes raise a question as to whether the "cluster" participants were as well prepared at graduation as their non-clustered and non-ST counterparts.

While the quality of the preparation was not part of the scope of the study, the interviewers sometimes heard about the on-the-job performance of some of the respondents. Some of the telephone and in-depth interviews were done during school time, thus the interviewers sometimes talked with the principal. When this happened, the principal usually volunteered a statement to the effect that the person was one of the best teachers in the school. One principal, who was not associated with the FT program, told an interviewer that she had never been disappointed with the ST people.

These remarks by supervisors do not constitute evidence regarding preparation or performance of the ST graduates. Further study might be done concerning the degree of preparation given by the various local programs and its relationship, if any, to the on-the-job performance of the ST graduates.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE/INFORMATION FORM

APPENDIX A
FORM APPROVED
FEDAC NO. S__41
APPROVAL EXPIRES JULY, 1980

PROJECT DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE/INFORMATION FORM

THE INTERVIEWER SHALL READ THE FOLLOWING TO EACH RESPONDENT:

"This study is authorized by law (20 U.S.C. §1441, 45 CFR 121.h2). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely."

PROJECT CODE NO. _____

PROJECT NAME: _____

PROJECT ADDRESS: _____

_____

PROJECT PHONE NUMBER: _____

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S NAME: _____

YEARS AS PROJECT DIRECTOR: _____

INTERVIEWER: _____

CONTACT DATES	CONTACT TIMES	COMMENTS
(1) _____	Start: _____ Finish: _____	
(2) _____	Start: _____ Finish: _____	
(3) _____	Start: _____ Finish: _____	
(4) _____	Start: _____ Finish: _____	
(5) _____	Start: _____ Finish: _____	

DATA COLLECTION SHEET

Student I.D. Code No.	CONTACT DATA				ACADEMIC DATA											EMPLOYMENT DATA		
	Supplementary Training Participant Names	Participant's Home Address	Home Telephone Number	Work Telephone Number	Presently Enrolled	Graduated (Date)	Dropped Out (Date)	Credits Hours 74-75	Credits Hours 75-76	Credits Hours 76-77	Credits Hours 77-78	Total Credits Hours Earned	Most Recent Grade Point Average	Major Field of Study	Presently Employed	Presently Unemployed	Training Position Title
11	Mary Doe																
12	Gladys Ryskin																
13	Mildred Froam																
14	Sylvia Plaster																
15	Carmen Wood																

ATTACHMENT NO. 7

The following questions are for the purpose of either verifying data collected or retrieving data not found to date. The questions in this section relate to program characteristics.

OBJECTIVE CODE

The procedure will be to read the category. If we have recorded data within the category, we would request that you verify. In cases where you see a category with partial or no data, we would request that you supply us with the missing data. Please proceed.

C 1. Does the FT/ST project operate within an area with a population of:

250,000 or over	_____	10,000 - 50,000	_____
100,000 - 250,000	_____	2,500 - 10,000	_____
50,000 - 100,000	_____	Less than 2,500	_____

A,B,C 2. What is the project local school district affiliation:

_____

_____

If this is not correct, what are the changes: _____

A,C 3. What is the project college/university affiliation:

_____

_____

If this is not correct, what are the changes: _____

A,B,C 4. Our records indicate that your funding for the school years 1974/75 to 1977-78 by school year was:

1974/75 _____
1975/76 _____
1976/77 _____
1977/78 _____

If this is not correct, what are the changes: _____

OBJECTIVE CODES

A,B,C 5. Our records indicate that your per capita cost (includes tuition, books, travel, etc.) for the school years 1974/75 to 1977/78 by school year was:

1974/75 _____

1975/76 _____

1976/77 _____

1977/78 _____

If this is not correct, what are the changes: _____

A,B,C 6. Our records do not provide us with the number of FT/ST project staff positions. would you please tell us the individual positions (by title) and the number of years each person has been working in the program. Also, could you provide us with the credentials (e.g., Masters degree in counseling) held by each individual listed. Include LEA staff if they are hired specifically for the FT/ST project staff. Do not include course instructors from cooperating colleges or universities.

Positions	Years in Program	Credentials

A,B,C 7. Our records indicate that the FT/ST model employed by your project was:

_____

We thank you for your time and assistance. We also wish to remind you that we will be contacting you again by telephone to gather further information on your attitudes about the effectiveness of Supplementary Training.

(To Be Conducted by Telephone)

In this group of questions we would like to obtain your attitudes on the general effectiveness of the program.

*(Interviewer. Use the following weighting system for recording the respondents rating for part "a" of each question: extremely effective (4); effective (3); less than effective (2); and not effective(1).)

Generally, the questions are geared to register your feelings on how well you felt the program promoted certain areas.

OBJECTIVES CODES		not effective	less than effective	effective	extremely effecti
A	1. How effective was the overall program in helping in the career development of program participants?	1	2	3	4
A	2. In your opinion, how effective do you feel the specific training experience was for helping participants in their career developments?	1	2	3	4
A,C	3. In your opinion, how effective do you feel the program was in providing services (e.g. tutoring, counseling, advisement) to help the participant in achieving academic success?	1	2	3	4
A,B	4. In your opinion, how effective do you feel the additional education (beyond high school) is as a means of improving the income status of program participants?	1	2	3	4
B	5. In your opinion, how effective do you feel the program is as a means of improving the attitudes of participants' children about education?	1	2	3	4
C	6. In your opinion, how effective do you feel the program was in meeting the specific needs (on an individual basis) of the program participant?	1	2	3	4
A	7. In your opinion, how effective overall do you feel the program was for helping participants?	1	2	3	4

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. I hope we will be able to call upon you again if any further clarification is needed. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

OBJECTIVE CODES

B,C 3. What percentage of supplementary training trainees who earned college credits returned to the follow-through program?

0 - 25% _____ 26 - 50% _____ 51 - 75% _____ 76 - 100% _____

B 9. Did skills acquired in supplementary training have a positive effect upon the follow-through program?

Negative _____

Marginal _____

None _____

Positive _____

APPENDIX B
FORM APPROVED
FEDAC NO. S 41
APPROVAL EXPIRES JULY, 1980

SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING PARTICIPANT TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE

THE INTERVIEWER SHALL READ THE FOLLOWING TO EACH RESPONDENT:

"This study is authorized by law (20 U.S.C.§1111, 45 CFR 121.b2). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely."

PROJECT CODE NO. _____

PARTICIPANT I.D. NO. _____

PARTICIPANT NAME: _____

PARTICIPANT TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____

PARTICIPANT ADDRESS IF NECESSARY: _____

_____

INTERVIEWER: _____

CONTACT DATE: _____ STARTED: _____

CONTACT TIME: _____ FINISHED: _____

COMMENTS:

OBJECTIVE CODES

I. EDUCATION INFORMATION

This group of questions pertains to your educational background.

A,B,C 1. When did you start in the Supplementary Training Program: _____

C 2. What was the last grade you completed before entering the program.

(a) _____ Grade school or less. (K-8)
(b) _____ Some high school, but did not graduate. (9-11)
(c) _____ Graduated from high school. (12)
(d) _____ Technical or business school after high school.
(e) _____ Some college, but less than two years.
(f) _____ Some college, but more than two years.
(g) _____ College with an associate degree.
(h) _____ Other (please specify).

*(Interviewer. If the respondent answer falls in categories (d) through (h), please identify the school and list below.)

_____

C 3. How many years were you out of school before you entered the program (e.g., high school, etc.):

(a) _____ 0 Years.
(b) _____ 1-4 Years.
(c) _____ 5-9 Years.
(d) _____ 10-14 Years.
(e) _____ 15 or More Years.

A 4. Are you presently participating in the program:

Yes _____ (skip next two questions)
No _____

A 5. If no, what was your reason(s) for termination from the program:

_____

_____

_____

OBJECTIVE CODES

I. EDUCATION INFORMATION (continued)

A 6. Do you intend to return to the program:

Yes _____

No _____

A 7. Which of the following is your present or most advanced college status:

Freshman _____

Sophomore _____

Junior _____

Senior _____

Other _____ (please specify) _____

A,C 8. How many credit hours have you accumulated in the ST program:

Semester hours _____

Trimester hours _____

Quarter hours _____

Do not know _____

A,B 9. What was your major field of study when you entered the program:

*(Interviewer is advised to record the response and then see the coding reference following questions to fill in the code numbers.)

Field of study _____ Code No. _____

A,B 10. Did you change majors while in the program:

Yes _____

No _____ (skip next question)

A,B 11. If yes, please indicate major field of study changes; from first to last change, if more than one.

*(Interviewer. Record responses, then see reference for coding.)

Changes Field of Study to: _____ Code No. _____

Changed Field of Study to: _____ Code No. _____

Changed Field of Study to: _____ Code No. _____

A. ACADEMIC (4-year) MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY

1. Agriculture and Natural Resources
2. Architecture and Environmental Design
3. Area Studies
4. Biological Sciences
5. Business and Management
6. Communications (incl. Journalism, Radio/TV, Advertising)
7. Computer and Information Sciences
8. Education
9. Engineering
10. English (incl. Linguistics, Literature, Speech, Creative Writing)
11. Fine and Applied Arts
12. Foreign Languages
13. Health Professions
14. Home Economics
15. Law
16. Library Science
17. Mathematics
18. Military Sciences
19. Philosophy
20. Physical Sciences (incl. Astronomy, Geology, Oceanography)
21. Psychology
22. Public Affairs and Services (incl. Law Enforcement, Parks and Recreation)
23. Religion and Theology
24. Social Sciences (incl. Anthropology, Economics, Criminology, Urban Studies)
25. Interdisciplinary Studies (combinations of major areas of study)

B. VOCATIONAL/TECHNOLOGICAL (2-year Associate Degrees)

1. Business and Commerce Technologies
2. Data Processing Technologies
3. Education Technologies (incl. Teacher Aides, Other Paraprofessionals)
4. Health Services and Paramedical Technologies
5. Mechanical/Technical/Engineering Fields
6. Natural Science Technologies
7. Public Services Related Technologies

OBJECTIVE CODES

I. EDUCATION INFORMATION (continued)

A,B 12. What was your most recent grade point average for the ST program:

Grade point average _____

*(Interviewer. For those respondents that have terminated, ask what their grade point average was before leaving the program.)

II. PARTICIPANT RATING OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

In this group of questions, we would like to obtain your rating of the effectiveness of the program. You may select one of four rating responses: extremely effective, effective, less than effective, or not effective.

OBJECTIVE CODES		not effective	less than effective	effective	extremely effective
A	1. How effective was the overall program in helping in your career development?	1	2	3	4
A	2. How effective do you feel the specific training experience was in helping you in your career development?	1	2	3	4
A,C	3. How effective do you feel the program was in providing services (e.g., tutoring, counseling, advisement, etc.) to help you in achieving academic success?	1	2	3	4
A,B	4. How effective do you feel that additional education (beyond high school) is as a means of improving your income status?	1	2	3	4
B	5. How effective do you feel the program was as a means of improving your child's/ children's attitudes about education?	1	2	3	4
C	6. How effective do you feel the program was in meeting your specific needs?	1	2	3	4
A	7. How effective do you feel the program was overall in helping participants?	1	2	3	4

OBJECTIVE CODES

III. SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

The next group of questions pertain to your employment status and income.

A,C 1. Before you started the program, were you:

Employed full-time _____
Employed part-time _____
Unemployed _____
Retired _____
Housewife _____

(If the respondent is unemployed, retired, or housewife, skip the next two questions.

A,C 2. What was your job before you entered the program:

Job Title _____ Code No. _____

*(Interviewer. Please fill in the respondents job title and related code number; see the reference on the following page.)

A,C 3. I am going to read you several categories of yearly personal income. Please tell me which category you fell into before you entered the program:

0 Income _____
Less than $4,999 _____
$5,000 - $9,999 _____
$10,000 - $14,999 _____
$15,000 - $19,999 _____
$20,000 - Above _____

A 4. Presently (as of the time of this interview), are you:

Employed _____
Unemployed _____
a. seeking work _____
b. not seeking work _____

(If the respondent is unemployed, retired, of housewife, skip the next two questions.)

Interviewers Job Coding Reference:

(1) Professional (e.g., accountant, teacher, doctor, social worker, researcher, engineer, registered nurse, etc.)

(2) Administrative Official (e.g., corporate officer, local, state, or federal official, etc.)

(3) Manager/Supervisor (e.g., department store manager, office manager, factory foreman, or supervisor, etc.)

(4) Technician (e.g., lab technician, draftsman, etc.)

(5) Sales (e.g., automobiles, insurance, department store, real estate, etc.)

(6) Skilled Worker (e.g., electrician, carpenter, seamstress, plumber, mechanic, etc.)

(7) Semi-Skilled Worker (e.g., clerk, aide, waiter, cook, machine operator, ect.)

(8) Unskilled worker (e.g., custodian, domestic worker, babysitter, gas station attendant, etc.).

(9) Housewife

(10) Other (please specify) _____

OBJECTIVE CODES

III. SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS (continued)

A 5. What is your job now:

Job Title _____ Code No. _____

A 6. I am going to read you several categories of yearly personal income. Please tell me which category you fall into presently.

0 Income _____
Less than $5,000 _____
$5,000 - $9,999 _____
$10,000 - $14,999 _____
$15,000 - $19,999 _____
$20,000 - Above _____

A,C 7. Before you entered the program did you live in an:

Apartment _____
House _____
Other (specify _____

A,C 8. Did you rent or own:

Rent _____
Own _____

A 9. In what type of dwelling do you now reside (please indicate from the following categories):

Apartment _____
House _____
Other (specify) _____

A 10. Do you rent or own:

Rent _____
Own _____

OBJECTIVE CODES

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

I would like to obtain some background information.

A,C 1. *(Interviewers should determine respondents sex by voice and name and check accordingly.)

Male _____ Female _____

A,C 2. Could you please tell me which of the following categories represents your present marital status:

Married _____
a. spouse present _____
b. spouse absent _____
Unmarried _____
a. never _____
b. widowed _____
c. divorced _____

A,C 3. Are you the sole head of the household:

Yes _____
No _____

A,C 4. Please tell me the number of your children living in the household, their ages and sex.

Ages	Sex
____	____
____	____
____	____
____	____

A,C 5. Has your child (children) ever been enrolled in the Follow Through program?

Yes _____
No _____

A,C 6. Are there any other persons in your household:

Participant's Mother _____
Participant's Father _____
Unrelated Individual _____
Other _____

OBJECTIVE CODES

IV. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION (continued)

A,C 7. Could you please tell me which of the categories represents your race:

(a) American Indian or Alaskan Native _____
(b) Asian or Pacific Islander _____
(c) Hispanic _____
(d) Black, Not of Hispanic Origin _____
(e) White, Not of Hispanic Origin _____

C 8. Could you please tell me your date of birth:

_____

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Our study includes an additional in-depth interview on-site of a sample of 200 participants. We would hope that you would consider participating in this interview if the sampling provides us with your name.

APPENDIX C

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
FOLLOW-THROUGH/SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX C
FORM APPROVED
FEDAC NO. S 41
APPROVAL EXPIRES JULY, 1980

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
FOLLOW-THROUGH/SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING PARTICIPANTS

THE INTERVIEWER SHALL READ THE FOLLOWING TO EACH RESPONDENT:

"This study is authorized by law (20 U.S.C.§1411, 45 CFR 121.h2). While you are not required to respond, your cooperation is needed to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely."

"C"

PROJECT CODE NO. _____

PARTICIPANT I.D. NO. _____

PARTICIPANT NAME: _____

PARTICIPANT TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____

PARTICIPANT ADDRESS IF NECESSARY: _____

_____

CLUSTER: _____ NON-CLUSTER: _____

INTERVIEWER: _____

CONTACT DATE: _____ STARTED: _____

CONTACT TIME: _____ FINISHED: _____

COMMENTS:

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW CONDUCT FOR ON-SITE PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

The purpose of this interview is to acquire more indepth information about participant feelings as they relate to the Follow-Through/Supplementary Training program. As you may know, the study is to compile a summary of past and present information from Supplementary Training participants and the impact the program has had on their lives.

A set of questions will be asked of you to determine the effectiveness of the Follow-Through/Supplementary Training program. The questions will concentrate on the Supplementary Training component.

Also, please be advised that throughout the interview the term "program" will be used. When speaking of the program we are referring to the supportive, academic, and training activities provided through Supplementary Training efforts.

There will be four areas of inquiry focused upon in this interview.

I. Program Administration
II. Academic/Educational Factors
III. Training Factors
IV. Life Effects

We would hope that you will provide us with your honest rating of program effectiveness on the questions asked in order for us to develop a comprehensive overview of program participant ratings of the different Supplementary Training characteristics. An example is that you will be given four choices for most questions to: (1) strongly agree; (2) agree; (3) disagree; or (4) strongly disagree, with the positiveness of a particular aspect of your program experience.

Before beginning we would like you to be aware that we are not asking you to evaluate the Follow-Through/Supplementary Training program. We are however, requesting your rating of how positive the impact of the program (e.g., administration) was/is on your life as a result of participation.

I. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

The following section is for the purpose of providing information about the administering of activities and experiences associated with the Supplementary Training (ST) program.

OBJECTIVE CODES		strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
A,B,C	1. The program was successful in informing instructors of the needs of the student. Comments:	1	2	3	4
C	2. The program was successful in recording information and coordinating it with the college/university registrar's office. Comments:	1	2	3	4
C	3. The program administration spoke out for the program to the college/university affiliate. Comments:	1	2	3	4

OBJECTIVE CODES	I. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION (continued)	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
A	4. The program administration spoke out for the program to the local school affiliates. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A	5. The Career Development Committee and the program administration worked well together. Comments:	1	2	3	4
B	6. The program administration provided ample opportunities for your participation in program planning. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B,C	7. The program's objectives were carried out by program administration. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B,C	8. The program staff was qualified to address your needs. Comments:	1	2	3	4

II. ACADEMIC/EDUCATIONAL FACTORS

The following section is for the purpose of providing information about the academic/educational activities and experiences in the ST program.

OBJECTIVE CODES		strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
C	1. The program helped you plan your course schedule. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,C	2. The program helped you: a. get your degree in less time.[1] Comments:	1	2	3	4
C	b. individually tailor your curriculum.[2] Comments:	1	2	3	4
A	c. obtain release time.[3] Comments:	1	2	3	4

OBJECTIVE CODES	II. ACADEMIC/EDUCATIONAL FACTORS (continued)	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
A	3. The program provided you with counseling to develop your course plans. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A	4. The program helped you with your registration and enrollment. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B	5. The program helped you to obtain any special arrangements you needed, such as student teaching, field experiences, etc. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B	6. The program informed you of college/university resources (e.g., tutoring) to aid you in your academic program. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A	7. The program provided support and encouragement to its students. Comments:	1	2	3	4

OBJECTIVE CODES	II. ACADEMIC/EDUCATIONAL FACTORS (continued)	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
A	8. The program helped you to achieve your academic objectives.	1	2	3	4
	Comments:				

III. TRAINING

The following section is for the purpose of providing information about the training experience associated with the ST program.

OBJECTIVE CODES		strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
A,B	1. Teachers in the public school had positive attitudes toward the advancement of trainees. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A	2. Trainees did not fear losing their jobs if they went to school full time. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B	3. Local school administrators (e.g., principal) had positive attitudes toward the advancement of trainees. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B	4. Teachers in the public school had positive attitudes toward the ST program. Comments:	1	2	3	4

OBJECTIVE CODES	III. TRAINING (continued)	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
A	5. At the completion of your training, the program aided you in obtaining a job. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B,C	6. The training in the ST program was a rewarding experience. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B,C	7. The program staff monitored your training activities. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B	8. The training allowed for trainee input (i.e., curriculum development). Comments:	1	2	3	4

IV. LIFE EFFECTS

The following section is for the purpose of providing information about the effects of the program on the life of the participant. Some of the questions asked may not be applicable to your present situation; if so, please state that the question does not apply.

OBJECTIVE CODES		strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
A	1. The program helped you increase your income. Comments:	1	2	3	4
B	2. Program participation has had a positive effect on your child/children's attitudes about school. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,B	3. Program participation has enabled you to qualify for a better job. Comments:	1	2	3	4
A,C	4. Program participation improved your attitude about education. Comments:	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX D

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY AFFILIATIONS OF THE PROJECT

APPENDIX D

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY AFFILIATIONS OF THE PROJECT

Listed below are the colleges and universities that are affiliated with the projects. This list is a partial listing, as it contains only those colleges and universities that were verified by the Project Directors. (As noted earlier, not all Project Directors returned the Project Director questionnaire.)

University of Missouri - Kansas City
Southeast Missouri State University
University of Nebraska
Westminster College (Utah)
Seattle Central Community College
University of Washington
Seattle University
Tacoma Community College
University of Puget Sound
Black Hills State College
University of South Dakota - Vermillion
Mayville State College
University of Miami
Okaloosa - Walton Junior College (Florida)
University of West Florida
Northern Georgia College
East Carolina University
Cleveland State Community College (Tennessee)
Lee College
Tougaldo College
West Georgia College
Atlanta Junior College
Aims Community College (Colorado)
Honolulu Community College
Kapiolani Community College
University of Hawaii
Southern Illinois University
State Community College (Illinois)

University of Southwestern Louisiana
New Mexico Highlands University
University of Oregon
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma
Del Mar College
Corpus Christi State University
Oklahoma Baptist University
Berkshire Community College (Massachusetts)
North Adams State College
Wheelock College
Bristol Community College (Massachusetts)
Roger Williams College
William Paterson College
Glassboro State College
Trenton State College
Mercer County Community College (New Jersey)
Cuyahoga Community College (Ohio)
Castleton State College
Lock Haven State College
Goddard College
University of Maine at Fort Kent
Southern Connecticut State College
South Central Community College (Connecticut)
North Texas State University
Texas Womans University
Tarrant County Community College (Texas)
Texas Wesleyan College

APPENDIX E

REFERENCES

APPENDIX E

REFERENCES

James Morrison, Eugene Watson, Jerry Goldstein, Compensatory Education in the Community College: An Interactivist Approach, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif, 1975, p.3.

Peter Ressi, Walter Williams, Evaluating Social Programs, Seminar Press, New York, 1972, p.181.

Report on the programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, prepared for the Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty and Migratory Labor, of the Committee on Human Resources, United States Senate.

A Guide to Program Policy, Management and Operations, U.S. Office of Education, Division of Follow Through, DHEW, Washington, D.C.,1975, p.2.

Statement appearing in the Request For Proposals ("Study of Supplementary Training Available to Follow Through Parents and Aides") issued by the Office of Evaluation and Dissemination, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, P.L. 88-452(78 STAT.508), as amended in P.L. 90-222,TOT.1, SEC. 104 (81 STAT.698,42 U.S.C. 2809 (a)(2) 1967).

Community Services Act of 1974, P.L. 93-644, Title V, Part B (USC 2929) known as "The Head Start-Follow Through Act".